

## REMARKS

### Status of the Claims

Claims 1-41 were pending.

Claims 1-41 were rejected.

Please **amend** claims 1, 3-7, 9, 11-14, 17, 20-30, 33, 39-41, **cancel** claims 2, 10, 37, 38, and **add** new claims 42, 43, 44.

Claims 1, 3 – 9, 11 – 36, 39-44 are now pending.

It is believed that the remarks laid out herein below attend to all rejections and further issues raised in the pending office action dated 17 May 2006.

### Remarks

### Claim Objections

Claims 1-25 were objected because of various informalities. Claim 1 has been amended to address the informalities raised by the Examiner.

The Examiner objected to claims 10-11 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 9.

Claim 11 has been amended to “... processing matrix are selected to cancel transmission echo cross-talk of the digital signal streams introduced during reception of the digital signal streams” to further differentiate this claim from claim 9 and 10.

Claim 9 is directed to the transceiver receiving the digital signal streams for transmission, whereas claim 10 (now claim 1) is directed to the transceiver receiving the digital signal streams. The transmitting configuration (claim 9) of the transceiver is shown, for example, in Figure 6, and includes the processing to the digital signal stream (S1, S2, S3, S4) before the digital signal stream are transmitted. The receiving configuration (claim 10) of the transceiver is shown, for example, in Figures 4 and 5,

and includes the processing of the digital signal streams (R1, R2, R3, R4) after the digital signal streams are transmitted.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph**

Claim 1, line 7, has been amended to “other of the joint processed digital signal streams”.

Claims 2 & 3, line 2 – claim 2 has been deleted, claim 3 has been amended to “the plurality of digital signal streams”.

Claims 17, 18, line 1, have been amended to resolve the antecedent basis problem.

Claim 20, line 1 has been amended to “the plurality of digital signal streams”.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 101**

Claims 1, 26, 27 were rejected under 35 USC 101 for claiming non-statutory subject matter. Claim 1 has been amended to “the transceiver receiving a plurality of digital signal streams”. Claim 26 has been amended to “the transceiver receiving a plurality of digital signal streams”. Claim 27 has been amended to “the transceiver receiving a plurality of digital signal streams for transmission”. Amended independent claim 7 includes “the transceiver receiving a plurality of digital signal streams for transmission”. Amended claim 11 includes “the transceiver receiving a plurality of digital signal streams”. Claims 39, 40, 41 have been amended to “the transceiver receiving a plurality of digital signal streams”.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner indicated that Claims 7-11 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to include all of the limitations of claim 10 and all intervening claims of claim 10. Therefore, claim 1 should be allowed. Claims 3-6, 12-20 are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed.

Claim 7 has been amended to include the limitations of the old base claim 1, and all intervening claims. Therefore, claim 7 should be allowed. Claim 8 is dependent on claim 7 and should be allowed.

Claim 9 has been amended to include the limitations of the old base claim 1, and all intervening claims. Therefore, claim 9 should be allowed.

Claim 11 has been amended to include the limitations of the old base claim 1, and all intervening claims. Therefore, claim 11 should be allowed. Claims 21-25, 42-44 are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 11 and should be allowed.

Claim 26 includes the limitations of new claim 1, and should be allowed.

Claim 27 includes the limitations of new claim 9, and should be allowed.

Claim 28 includes the limitations of new claim 1, and should be allowed.

Claim 29 includes the limitations of new claim 1, and should be allowed. Claims 30-36 are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 29, and should be allowed.

Claims 39, 40, 41 include the limitations of claim 1, and should be allowed.

### CONCLUSION

For the reasons given above, and after careful review of the cited reference, applicant respectfully submits that Jones et al (2004/0213146) and Hench (2006/0023645) do not result in, teach or suggest applicant's claimed invention.

In view of the above Remarks, applicant has addressed all issues raised in the Office Action dated 17 May 2006, and respectfully solicits a Notice of Allowance for claims 1, 3 – 9, 11 – 36, 39-44. Should any issues remain, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Brian Short

Brian Short, Reg. No. 41,309

Date: June 21, 2006

Ph. No. : 408-888-9830